THE QUALITIES COLLEGE STUDENTS WANT IN THEIR PROFESSORS VERSUS PROFESSORS' PERCEPTIONS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies and Research

Angelo State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

JAIMEE ALEXANDRA HALL

May 2021

Major: Applied Psychology

THE QUALITIES COLLEGE STUDENTS WANT IN THEIR PROFESSORS VERSUS PROFESSORS' PERCEPTIONS

by

JAIMEE ALEXANDRA HALL

APPROVED:

Dr. Drew Curtis

Dr. Kristi Moore

Dr. Brittany Draper

Dr. William Taylor

May 2021

APPROVED:

Dr. Micheal Salisbury
Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to all who have helped me throughout my thesis process. My deepest gratitude goes out to my thesis chair, former professor, former adviser, and overall academic mentor, Dr. Drew Curtis, for all your support and help throughout this thesis as well as throughout my entire academic career since the day I started at Angelo State University. You helped me realize my true passion in my life and gave me the courage to make the changes I needed to in my academic career. It has been an honor to learn from you over the years and see what true enthusiasm for teaching really looks like, and helping you grow an amazing student organization was one of the greatest experiences of my academic career. I also want to thank you for never failing to encourage me and help me, even when I come to you with what seems to me like the most inarticulate of questions. I will never be able to thank you enough for all the advice and knowledge you have given me, but I will try. Thank you.

I would like to thank my committee members for being an invaluable part of this journey. Dr. Kristi Moore, I appreciate your help and support throughout this process and your ability to see the missing details in my theories and ideas. I have enjoyed every second that I have been able to have you as my teacher, program director and committee member, and your support means a great deal to me. Dr. Brittany Draper, I am so grateful for your constant willingness to share your opinions and advice. It has been an honor to learn from you over the years and have your constant joy and encouragement to turn to. Dr. William Taylor, I would like to thank you for your help and support throughout this process. Even though this past year has been different and we never had the chance to properly meet and

discuss my goals for this project, you were still a constant source of support willing to help with anything I needed.

I would also like to thank Julia “D” Chandler for your encouragement throughout this project. I have been able to come to you with any problem in my life, and you always have the perfect words of peace and encouragement. Thank you so much for your friendship and unwavering support over the years.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends for all their encouragement and prayers throughout this experience. Hannah Foster and Tanner Thomas, thank you for always listening to my complaints and being there to help me make decisions that I am too indecisive to make. Cody Dutton and Paul Kelling, thank you for always providing me with the comedic relief I need and for listening to my problems even when you have no idea how to help. Finally, I would like to thank my amazing husband, John, who never fails to show me the love and support that I need to get through anything. Without you, I would never have stayed at this amazing University, and I would not have the friendships and relationships with the people that mean the most to me. I love you more.

ABSTRACT

One of the ways modern universities analyze the effectiveness of their professors' teaching is through student course evaluations, which most universities now utilize regularly to learn more about students' overall opinions of their professors and classes (Arnon & Reichel, 2007). However, course evaluations do not necessarily provide much insight into the specific qualities and characteristic that students are looking for in their professors and are not guaranteed to be used by professors to improve their teaching methods. The purpose of this study was to identify the specific characteristics that college students look for in their professors, whether they prioritize professor or class characteristics, and see whether professors are aware of students' priorities. Overall, results indicate that professors are aware of students' priorities to a certain degree but could still benefit from learning more about the specific characteristics students prioritize.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Tables **Page**

INTRODUCTION

One of the ways modern universities analyze the effectiveness of their professors' teaching is through student course evaluations. In fact, most universities now have regular evaluations for students to fill out regarding the quality of instruction that they have been given and their overall opinions of professors and classes (Arnon & Reichel, 2007). The simple addition of these end-of-course surveys has given students the opportunity to review their professors. However, these course evaluations do not necessarily provide all the necessary insight into the specific qualities and characteristics that students are looking for in their instructors and may not even be used by professors to improve their teaching methods.

The characteristics that students look for in their professors is a topic that has grown in popularity over recent years and accumulated much research. Overall, research has shown that, when asked which characteristics are most important for a professor to have, students largely note the same characteristics (Duff, 2017; Guelfi, et al., 2018) and profeessors largely note the same characteristics (Plavšić & Diković, 2016; Singh, et al., 2013). However, the characteristics that students note are not all the same characteristics that professors note (Duff, 2017; Guelfi, et al., 2018; Plavšić & Diković, 2016; Singh, et al., 2013). In fact, students tend to note characteristics related to professors' personalities and professors' ability to form relationships with their students (Duff, 2017; Guelfi, et al., 2018) while professors note characteristics related to their professional development and classroom behavior/instructional delivery (Singh, et al., 2013).

In addition, with higher education being moved more and more online, it is crucial to

---

Publication Manual of the APA

analyze the differences between the qualities that students look for in professors of online classes versus face-to-face classes. Since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of college students enrolled in online classes has jumped from 33% to over 97% (Bustamante, 2020; Lederman, 2018). Therefore, it is more important now than ever to understand the perspective of students taking online courses and whether the professors teaching online classes are what the students are looking for from their education. Additionally, with this quick shift to online education, the characteristics students are looking for in their professors have likely shifted as well compared to face-to-face classes, especially considering that research has already shown differences in what students are looking for in their professors in online classes versus face-to-face classes before online classes were a mandatory side effect from a worldwide pandemic (Glazier & Harris, 2020).

When looking at the need for good teaching and analyzing the qualities that encompass a master teacher, it is also important to understand where these qualities come from, whether great teachers are born or made. Is it a natural gift that makes some teachers great or is it their dedication to teaching that makes them stand out? Many researchers have wondered where the best, most effective teachers come from, whether they are born with natural gifts that make them great at teaching or if they are well-trained to become great teachers (Malikow, 2006; Scott & Dinham, 2008; Seif et al., 2011). Many researchers believe that it is in fact both natural gifts and a dedication to teaching that results in a master teacher (Malikow, 2006; Ross, 2015). However, this does not mean that it is impossible for an individual to be an excellent teacher without being naturally gifted.

Role of Course Evaluations

Course evaluations are not a new concept on university campuses. For years, colleges and universities have been using course evaluations to receive feedback from students on the quality of the instruction they were given and make decisions about the courses and professors based on this feedback. However, especially in recent years, course evaluations have become a highly debated topic. Recent surveys by the American Association of University Professors have shown that the ratings received on course evaluations had no significant correlation with students' learning (Vasey & Carroll, 2016). In fact, one study speculated based on their results that students' evaluations of their teachers "measure students' gender biases better than they measure the instructor's teaching effectiveness" (Boring et al., 2016, p. 11).

Specifically, at the university from which participants were recruited, the chosen form of course evaluations are IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction, which students are encouraged to complete within the last few weeks of every course (Office of Accountability, 2020). However, the creators of the IDEA survey themselves state that student ratings from this survey alone are an “insufficient source of evidence” and recommend that the ratings count as “no more than 30% to 50% of the overall teaching evaluation” (Benton & Li, 2015, p. 1). While this is not the only source of feedback used at the university to evaluate teaching, it is the only source in which students are able to share their opinions of their classes and professors easily and anonymously in a format that professors are encouraged to read (Office of Accountability, 2020). Therefore, while course evaluations do effectively provide administrators and professors with invaluable insights into the thoughts and opinions of students, they do not capture aspects of professor characteristics and the specific

characteristics that students are looking for in their professors. This then prompts the questions: if the source that professors are meant to rely on to see if their teaching methods are effective does not portray all the information they need, then do professors really know what students are looking for?

Characteristics Consensus and Lack of Consensus

Several studies have been conducted regarding the qualities that students look for in their instructors, and there seems to be a consensus on what those characteristics include (Arnon & Reichel, 2007; Duff, 2017; Mandernach, 2009; Smith et al., 2019). One study used direct interviews with both students and professors and reported the results of the qualities mentioned most often (Duff, 2017). The results showed that students most often mentioned desiring qualities related to personal connection (24 mentions), personality (10), teaching techniques (7), and accessibility outside of the classroom (6) while professors most often mentioned qualities related to personal connection (28 mentions), accessibility (23), attitude (13), class rigor (11), and knowledge (10) (Duff, 2017). Additionally, Mandernach (2009) proposed that one of the main ways to increase student engagement is by instructors fostering a personal connection with their students. Other research has shown that students believe the most important characteristics their teachers should have are “knowledge and mastery of content,” and “clarity in explanations,” followed by “content preparation” and “relationships between students and teachers” (Guelfi et al., 2018, p. 1).

Another study investigated the characteristics of the ideal teacher from the perspective of students in a teacher education program who were either student teachers or beginning teachers (Arnon & Reichel, 2007). These results showed that 32%-62% of participants believed the most important qualities in an ideal teacher were a good attitude,

"general personal qualities," leadership and knowledge (Arnon & Reichel, 2007, p. 452). The qualities specifically mentioned within the category of "general personal qualities" included a teacher that is kind, fair, and has a sense of humor (Arnon & Reichel, 2007, p. 452). Additionally, Arnon and Reichel (2007) split the qualities most cited by participants into qualities related to the personality of the teacher and qualities related to the professor's professional knowledge. Within these two categories, more qualities were noted within the personality category than the professional knowledge category, and the personality qualities were cited more often by students as the qualities of an ideal teacher (Arnon & Reichel, 2007).

However, even though both students and professors recognize the importance of a personal connection in the classroom (Duff, 2017) and the overall body of research on what students prefer is growing (Smith et al., 2019), there is a lack of research to support a consensus between students and the very professors that they are reviewing. Instead, research is suggesting that the characteristics professors believe students are looking are not entirely accurate (Klafke et al., 2020; Plavšić & Diković, 2016). One study found that even in the elementary school setting where it is children whose opinions of their teachers matter most, the teachers noted "patience" and "discipline management" as some of their most important characteristics while students noted "humor" and "teaching skills" (Plavšić & Diković, 2016, p. 122). Even though there are natural differences between elementary education and college education, this study is more proof of a lack of consensus between students and teachers. Another study found that students specifically wanted respectful relationships with their professors but instead were sometimes given disrespect and no empathy (Klafke et al., 2020). Based on the research provided, professors seem to believe that students care about

characteristics of the class itself, the professional knowledge of the professor, and various other characteristics, including characteristics related to the personality and personability of the professor; however, the professor's personality and ability to relate to their students is much higher of a priority than professors realize.

How Online Classes Might Differ

In 2018, over 33% of all students enrolled in higher education were enrolled in at least one online class (Lederman, 2018). However, with the global COVID-19 pandemic in full swing, online courses have become more necessary, with a total of 97% of college students now enrolled in online classes (Bustamante, 2020). It is more important now than ever to understand the perspective of students taking online courses and whether the professors teaching online classes are what the students are looking for from their education.

Student engagement is cited as one of the most important factors related to students' success in an online course (Chakraborty & Nafukho, 2014). Research has shown that the best strategies for student engagement in online courses include maintaining a positive environment for students to learn in, building a community relationship with students, and providing consistent feedback in a timely manner (Chakraborty & Nafukho, 2014). Other researchers looked at the difference between a teaching activity and a syllabus review on the first day of class in both face-to-face and online classes and found that a teaching activity promoted more positive impressions of the professors and increased motivation in the students in face-to-face classes (Curtis & Moore, 2018). However, in the online classes, the first day activity instead yielded more positive attitudes from the students and increased motivation with no significant difference in impressions of the professors (Moore, et al., 2018).

Another study looked at the characteristics noted by students in both online and face-to-face classes when asked to talk about their favorite class (Glazier & Harris, 2020). These results showed that, of the 14 total characteristics most often cited by students regarding their favorite professor, 7 of the characteristics had a statistically significant difference of means between online and face-to-face classes (Glazier & Harris, 2020). Based on this information, students in online courses seem to want different things out of their professors than students in face-to-face courses. Therefore, the qualities that online students prioritize in their classes and professors will likely differ from those of face-to-face students as well.

Where Great Teachers Come From

Many researchers have wondered about where the best, most effective teachers come from, whether they are born with natural gifts that make them great at teaching or if they are well-trained to become great teachers (Malikow, 2006; Scott & Dinham, 2008; Seif et al., 2011). Some believe that master teachers are trained to be great and that it is their motivation, dedication to teaching and willingness to learn that makes great teachers who they are (Scott & Dinham, 2008; Seif et al., 2011).

Instead, Malikow (2006) proposed that the most exceptional teachers are in fact both born and made, both naturally gifted in their abilities and trained well in pedagogy. His idea states that some people are born with natural qualities and personality characteristics that provide them with a natural advantage when it comes to teaching but even those most favorably gifted naturally for teaching require training in pedagogy to be exceptionally effective (Malikow, 2006). Similarly, another study found that while there are some characteristics of truly influential teachers that cannot be learned, there is still a certain aspect of great teaching that must be learned through training and experience (Ross, 2015). One

professor herself agreed with this idea by saying that the gift of teaching comes naturally to some individuals while others must work hard to become a great teacher (Orlando, 2013). Therefore, it seems that it is the combination of both inborn personality characteristics and dedication to teaching that results in the most effective teachers.

STUDY

Purpose

The overall intent for this study was that the results would shed light on the differences between the two perceptions and be a start to informing professors of the qualities students desire. The goal of this study was to identify whether students at state university in Texas prioritize professor personality and personability over class structure characteristics in face-to-face classes. Additionally, this study was seeking to identify whether professors at the same university believe students instead prioritize class structure characteristics over professor personality and personability. This study was also seeking to identify the differences, if any, between the characteristics students prioritize in online classes versus face-to-face classes. Finally, this study was seeking to identify whether the professors read, believe, and use the feedback and end-of-course reviews they receive from students to improve their teaching.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Question 1. Do students prioritize professor personality and personability or class structure characteristics?

Hypothesis 1. It is expected that students will report prioritizing items related to professor personality and personability over items related to class structure. A paired samples *t*-test will be used to analyze the differences between the total characteristic sums of professor characteristics versus class characteristics.

Question 2. Do professors believe students prioritize class structure characteristics or professor personality and personability?

Hypothesis 2. It is expected that professors will report believing that students prioritize items related to class structure over items related to professor personality and personability. A paired samples *t*-test will be used to analyze the differences between the total characteristic sums of professor characteristics versus class characteristics. Then, an independent samples *t*-test will be used to compare the characteristic sums from students to the characteristic sums from professors.

Question 3. Do students prioritize different characteristics in their professors and/or classes when the class is online versus face-to-face? If so, are professors aware of this difference?

Hypothesis 3. It is expected that students will report a higher priority on class structure characteristics in online classes versus face-to-face classes but still maintain an overall higher prioritization of professor personality and personability characteristics. It is also expected that professors will report a more similar prioritization of characteristics with students in online classes versus face-to-face classes. Independent samples *t*-tests will be used to compare the characteristic sums from online students to those from face-to-face students, as well as the characteristic sums from online professors to those from face-to-face professors.

Question 4. Do professors read and believe the reviews they receive from student reports and use them to improve their teaching methods and personal skills with students?

Hypothesis 4. It is expected that professors will report reading a small amount of student reviews and believing and utilizing the good reviews while disregarding the bad reviews. A frequency analysis will be used to determine the overall mean for each question, then paired samples *t*-tests will be used to compare the means between the questions.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The study recruited an initial sample size of 177 students and 30 professors. The data were analyzed for duplicated and missing responses, upon which such data were excluded from further analyses. In total, 41 students and 4 professors were excluded. The remaining participants consisted of 136 students with ages ranging from 18 to 37 years old (M = 20.04, SD = 3.098) and 26 professors with ages ranging from 28 to 60 years old (M = 42.92, SD = 8.850). The participants were all recruited from Angelo State University and were recruited both by recruitment emails sent to Department Heads and Professors and through Sona System, a website that allows students enrolled in certain classes at Angelo State University the ability to participate in research studies on campus in exchange for extra credit or required class credits.

A frequency analysis was conducted on the student demographic data collected, which indicated that the student participants were made up of 108 females (79.4%) and 28 males (20.6%). When asked to state the gender in which they identify with, 105 student participants identified as a woman (77.2%), 27 identified as a man (19.9%), 3 identified as transgender (2.2%), and 1 chose not to state their preferred gender (0.7%). Overall, the racial/ethnic makeup of the student participants in the sample consisted of Caucasian/European American (50.0%), Hispanic/Latinx (33.1%), African American/Black (8.1%), Biracial (3.7%), Multi-racial (2.2%), Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander (1.5%), Native American/Alaskan Native (0.7%) and no response (0.7%). The classifications of the students were identified as 44.9% Freshman, 19.9% Sophomore, 16.9% Junior, 16.9% Senior and 1.5% Graduate Student. Additionally, the most common undergraduate majors reported

were Nursing (25.0%), Psychology and Sociology (16.2%), Health Science Professions (12.5%) and Kinesiology (9.6%). The most common graduate degrees reported were Nursing/Nurse Educator (16.7%) and Social Work (14.3%). Overall, 33 student participants (24.3%) identified as online students and 103 (75.7%) identified as face-to-face students.

A frequency analysis was conducted on the professor demographic data collected as well, which indicated that the professor participants were made up of 10 females (38.5%), 14 males (53.8%) and 2 professor participants (7.7%) who chose not to provide their sex. When asked to state the gender in which they identify with, 10 professor participants identified as a woman (38.5%), 14 identified as a man (53.8%), and 2 chose not to respond (7.7%). The racial/ethnic makeup of the professor participants in the sample consisted of Caucasian/European American (80.8%), Hispanic/Latinx (7.7%), no response (7.7%), and Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander (3.8%). The education levels reported by professor participants were 20 Doctorate Degrees (76.9%), 5 Master's Degrees (19.2%) and 1 professor (3.8%) who has received their master's degree and is currently pursuing their Doctorate. The years of teaching experience reported can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1.

Years of Teaching Experience Reported by Professor Participants

	Frequency	Percent
<1 year	1	3.8
3-5 years	4	15.4
6-10 years	5	19.2
11-15 years	8	30.8
16-20 years	1	3.8
21+ years	7	26.9
Total	26	99.9

Measures

The study utilized three different measures for each participant, a Demographic Questionnaire, an Instructor and Course Characteristic Scale, and an Instructor and Course Characteristic Rank.

Demographic Questionnaire. All student participants were asked to complete a Student Demographic Questionnaire (Appendix A). This questionnaire asked student participants to provide information about their age, sex, gender, ethnicity and race, classification, and major. All professor participants were asked to complete a Professor Demographic Questionnaire (Appendix B). This questionnaire asked professor participants to provide information about their age, sex, gender, ethnicity and race, department, education, and years of teaching experience. All questions included in both demographics questionnaires were optional to allow participants to not answer any question(s) they believed might be too identifiable.

Instructor and Course Characteristic Scale – Face-To-Face. The instructor and Course Characteristic Scale – Face-To-Face (ICCS-FTF, Appendix C) is an 18-item questionnaire that was designed to assess the importance that students place on 18 individual characteristics of professors and classes in face-to-face courses. The ICCS-FTF was also used to assess the importance professors believe students place on the same 18 characteristics. It is on a 7-point Likert scale with “1” being “Not at all Important” and “7” being “Extremely Important.” Of the 18 items included in this scale, eight are characteristics directly related to class structure and eight are characteristics directly related to a professor’s teaching and social skills. This scale is a modified version of the Teacher Behavior Checklist, which consists of 28 total teacher qualities and corresponding behaviors. The Teacher

Behavior Checklist had a good Cronbach alpha at α = 0.93 (Kirby, et al., 2018). The reliability for the ICCS-FTF was a high internal consistency reliability (α = .90).

Instructor and Course Characteristic Scale – Online. The instructor and Course Characteristic Scale - Online (ICCS-O, Appendix D) is an 18-item questionnaire that was designed to assess the importance that students place on 18 individual characteristics of professors and classes in online courses. The ICCS-O contains 16 of the same questions as the ICCS-FTF with two of the questions slightly modified to align with the nature of online courses instead of face-to-face courses. The reliability for the ICCS-O was a high internal consistency reliability (α = .91).

Instructor and Course Characteristic Rank – Face-To-Face. The Instructor and Course Characteristic Rank – Face-To-Face (ICCR-FTF, Appendix E) is an 18-item modified version of the ICCS-FTF questionnaire that was designed to assess the relative importance of the same 18 characteristics by asking participants to rank the characteristics from "Most Important" as number "1" to "Least Important" as number "18." The reliability for the ICCR-FTF was a high internal consistency reliability (α = .861).

Instructor and Course Characteristic Rank – Online. The Instructor and Course Characteristic Rank - Online (ICCR-O, Appendix F) is an 18-item modified version of the ICCS-O questionnaire that was designed to assess the relative importance of the same 18 characteristics of online classes. The ICCR-O will also be used to assess the relative importance professors believe students place on these 18 characteristics of online classes. The reliability for the ICCR-O was a high internal consistency reliability (α = .837).

Procedure

Before starting the data collection process, the study obtained approval from the IRB Committee. Once approval from the IRB Committee was received, the study was created using Psychdata and posted on the SONA system to recruit student participants. The researcher also emailed the study link in a recruitment email to various department heads and professors to recruit professor participants and additional student participants across the entire campus. The emails provided a link to the study, hosted in Psychdata, and asked the recipient to share the study with fellow professors and their students.

Upon selecting the link to the study, participants were presented with an informed consent asking them to read and click "Continue" if they agree to participate in the current study. The informed consent explicitly discussed information related to participant anonymity and confidentiality. Due to the nature of the study being conducted online, through Psychdata, participants were not identified by the researcher and responses were all submitted anonymously. Students were asked only to fill in their name with the study if they were participating to receive credit in a class, and this information was used only to confirm identifies for distributing credits. Potential identifying information was the participants IP addresses and information requested on the Demographics Questionnaire.

After reading and consenting to participate in the research study, the participants were asked to identify whether they were participating in the study as a face-to-face student, an online student, a face-to-face instructor, or an online professor. Student participants were then presented with the Student Demographic Questionnaire while professor participants were presented with the Professor Demographic Questionnaire. Next, student participants were presented with an initial question about whether they decide their classes based more on

the classes themselves or the professors teaching the classes (Appendix G). This question was used to assess students' initial beliefs about whether they place higher value on characteristics of the class structure or the professor's teaching and social skills. Following the demographic questionnaire, professors were presented with seven initial questions about their personal opinions and use of student feedback (Appendix H). These questions were used to assess professors' self-reports about whether they read/listen to student feedback about their teaching, believe the feedback they receive, use that feedback to improve their teaching methods, and value student feedback.

Then, both face-to-face students and face-to-face professors were presented with the ICCS-FTF followed by the ICCR-FTF and both online students and online professors were presented with the ICCS-O followed by the ICCR-O. Lastly, student participants were presented with an open-ended question about their favorite professor or class and what made that professor or experience stand out (Appendix I). This additional question for students was used to assess whether the characteristics described in the ICCS and ICCR are the same characteristics students reported finding in their favorite classes and professors.

RESULTS

The initial data set consisted of 177 students and 30 professors. The data were analyzed for duplicated and missing responses, upon which such data were excluded from further analyses. In total, 41 students and 4 professors were excluded.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Question 1. Do students prioritize professor personality and personability or class structure characteristics?

Hypothesis 1. To analyze the overall importance students place on the eight class characteristics versus the eight professor characteristics, the scores from the ICCS-FTF and ICCS-O were separated into class characteristics scores and professor characteristics scores and compared. A total importance score was obtained for each student based on their ratings of the class characteristics and the professor characteristics. A paired samples *t*-test was then conducted, which found a statistically significant difference between the average sum of professor characteristics ($M = 57.26$, $SD = 6.187$) and class characteristics ($M = 47.54$, $SD = 8.242$) indicated by students, $t(135) = 14.97$, $p < .000$, $d = 1.33$. Therefore, students do prioritize professor personality and personability over class structure characteristics.

To further compare the overall importance students place on each characteristic, the rankings from the ICCR-FTF and ICCR-O were used. The average ranking was obtained for each characteristic to identify which characteristics are of highest importance to students. The average ranks by students of all the characteristics are shown in Table 2.

Question 2. Do professors believe students prioritize class structure characteristics or professor personality and personability?

Hypothesis 2. To analyze the overall importance professors believe students place on the eight class characteristics versus the eight professor characteristics, the scores from the ICCS-FTF and ICCS-O were separated into class characteristics scores and professor characteristics scores. A total importance score was obtained for each professor based on their ratings of the class characteristics and the professor characteristics. A paired samples *t*-test was then conducted, which found a statistically significant difference between the lower average sum of class characteristics ($M = 45.62$, $SD = 6.975$) and the higher average sum of professor characteristics ($M = 54.73$, $SD = 5.855$) indicated by professors, $t(25) = 7.076$, $p < .000$, $d = 1.41$.

The total scores for class characteristics and professor characteristics from student participants were compared to the total scores from professors using an independent samples *t*-test. Overall, no statistically significant difference was found between students ($M = 57.26$, $SD = 6.187$) and professors ($M = 54.73$, $SD = 5.855$) on the sums of the ratings given for professor characteristics, $t(160) = 1.92$, $p = .056$, $d = 0.42$. Similarly, no statistically significant difference was found between students ($M = 47.54$, $SD = 8.242$) and professors ($M = 45.62$, $SD = 6.975$) on the sums of the ratings given for class characteristics, $t(160) = 1.11$, $p = .267$, $d = 0.25$. Therefore, professors do recognize the higher importance students place on professor characteristics compared class characteristics.

To further compare the overall importance professors believe students place on each characteristic, the rankings from the ICCR-FTF and ICCR-O were used. The average ranking was obtained for each characteristic to identify which characteristics professors think are of highest importance to students. The average ranks by professors of all the characteristics are shown in Table 2.

Table 2.

Comparison of the Overall Characteristic Rankings by Students and Professors

Characteristic	Rank Based on Student Average	Rank Based on Professor Average
Professor who is personable and approachable	1	2
Professor who is an effective communicator	2	1
Professor who is enthusiastic about teaching and the subject	3	3
Professor who has a positive attitude and a good sense of humor	4	7
Fair and reasonable grading	5	4
Professor who provides constructive and helpful feedback	6	8
Professor who is a good listener and values students' opinions	7	12
Professor who has realistic expectations of students	8	6
Class with a detailed syllabus and schedule that is followed	9	9
Professor who is respectful of your time and manages class time wisely	10	5
Professor who listens to student feedback and constantly strives to improve their teaching	11	13
Interesting and/or relevant course content	12	10
Amount and type of homework and exams	13	11
Whether or not exams are open textbook/open note	14	17
How many class materials you will be required to purchase	15	16
Clear course rules and classroom order	16	14
How much writing is required for exams and homework	17	15
Whether attendance is required and/or if reasonable absences are allowed	18	16

Question 3. Do students prioritize different characteristics in their professors and/or classes when the class is online versus face-to-face? If so, are professors aware of this difference?

Hypothesis 3. To examine whether students prioritize different characteristics in online classes compared to face-to-face classes, the results from the ICCS-FTF and ICCR-FTF for face-to-face students and the ICCS-O and ICCR-O for online students were compared using an independent samples *t*-test, which revealed no statistically significant difference between online students (M = 57.09, SD = 6.502) and face-to-face students (M = 57.31, SD = 6.115) on the professor characteristic sums, $t(134) = .177$, $p = .860$, $d = 0.03$. Similarly, the independent samples *t*-test revealed no statistically significant difference between online students (M = 47.12, SD = 8.699) and face-to-face students (M = 47.67, SD = 8.129) on the class characteristic sums, $t(134) = .332$, $p = .741$, $d = 0.07$. Additionally, an independent samples *t*-test revealed no statistically significant difference between online students (M = 57.15, SD = 30.96) and face-to-face students (M = 60.72, SD = 30.82) on the professor characteristics ranks, $t(133) = .577$, $p = .565$, $d = 0.12$, and no statistically significant difference between online students (M = 85.33, SD = 33.78) and face-to-face students (M = 90.64, SD = 33.09) on the class characteristics ranks, $t(133) = .796$, $p = .427$, $d = 0.16$.

Additionally, to examine whether professors reported no significant differences in students' priorities between face-to-face and online classes, an independent samples *t*-test was used to compare the results from the ICCS-FTF and ICCR-FTF for face-to-face professors to the results from the ICCS-O and ICCR-O for online professors. The independent samples *t*-test revealed only one statistically significant difference, which was

found in what professors reported for the professor characteristics sums between online students (M = 59.29, SD = 2.498) and face-to-face students (M = 53.06, SD = 5.873), $t(24)$ = -2.69, p = .013, d = 1.38. Therefore, to a certain degree, professors do believe there is a difference in what students are looking for in online classes versus face-to-face classes.

Question 4. Do professors read and believe the reviews they receive from student reports and use them to improve their teaching methods and personal skills with students?

Hypothesis 4. To examine whether professors read, believe, and use student feedback, frequency analyses were run the professor participant responses for each of the first six questions. The average score given to each of these questions by professors on a scale of 1 (Never) to 7 (Always) is shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3.

Average Scores from Professors on the First Six Questions

Question Number	Question	Average Professor Response
1	How often do you read IDEA evaluations or other student feedback about your teaching?	6.77
2	How often do you listen to word-of-mouth student feedback about your teaching?	6.36
3	How often do you believe the student feedback that you hear/read?	5.42
4	How often do you use positive qualitative feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?	5.85
5	How often do you use negative qualitative feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?	5.69
6	How valuable do you consider student feedback to be?	6.08

Exploratory analyses were performed on the data collected from professors through these initial six questions. First, a paired samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between question 1 (M = 6.77, SD = .652) and question 6 (M =6.08, SD = 1.13), $t(25) = 3.80$, $p = .001$, $d = .748$. Therefore, there is a statistically significant difference between how often professors report reading IDEA evaluations and other student feedback and how valuable they believe that feedback to be. Another paired samples *t*-test revealed a statistically significant difference between question 1 (M = 6.77, SD = .652) and question 2 (M = 6.36, SD = .952), $t(24) = 2.45$, $p = .022$, $d = .503$, suggesting that professors read student feedback more often than they listen to student feedback. Additionally, paired samples *t*-tests revealed that there were statistically significant differences between question 1 (M = 6.77, SD = .652) and question 3 (M = 5.42, SD = .902), $t(25) = 6.08$, $p < .000$, d = 1.72, and between question 2 (M = 6.36, SD = .952) and question 3 (M = 5.42, SD = .902), $t(24) = 4.43$, $p < .000$, $d = 1.01$. Therefore, there is a statistically significant difference between how often professors read student feedback versus believe it as well as between how often professors listen to student feedback versus believe it. However, there was no statistically significant difference between how often professors reported using positive feedback (M = 5.85, SD = 1.05) versus negative feedback (M = 5.69, SD = 1.09) to improve their teaching methods, $t(25) = .941$, $p = .356$, $d = .150$. Therefore, professors report using positive and negative feedback equally to improve their teaching methods. A chi-square analysis was also performed on the initial six questions asked of professors. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Chi-square Results for Initial Six Professor Questions

	…read IDEA evaluations or other student feedback about your teaching?	…listen to word-of-mouth student feedback about your teaching?	…believe the student feedback that you hear/read?	…use positive qualitative feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?	…use negative qualitative feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?	How valuable do you consider student feedback to be?
…read IDEA evaluations or other student feedback about your teaching?						
…listen to word-of-mouth student feedback about your teaching?	.018*					
…believe the student feedback that you hear/read?	.250	.385				
…use positive qualitative feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?	.005**	.091	.048*			
…use negative qualitative feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?	.011*	.222	.156	.001**		
How valuable do you consider student feedback to be?	.000***	.003**	.092	.007**	.038*	

*$\chi^2 < .05$. **$\chi^2 < .01$. ***$\chi^2 < .001$

Additionally, the responses on the initial question for student participants were examined using a frequency analysis to see if students' initial beliefs about whether they choose classes based on the class or the professor matches the results from the ICCS-FTF and ICCS-O. Overall, 67 students (49.3%) stated basing their decision on which classes to take on the class itself, while 54 students (39.7%) stated that they base the decision on the professor teaching the class and 15 students (11.0%) stated that they base the decision on both factors or a different factor not listed. Therefore, students report choosing classes based on characteristics of the class itself, but rank characteristics of the professor as more important. The responses on the final, open-ended question for student participants were examined using a word cloud to identify whether the characteristics of classes and/or professors that stood out to students are the characteristics that were included in the ICCS-FTF, ICCS-O, ICCR-FTF and ICCR-O. Overall, the words most used in the open-ended responses were "professor," "approachable," "enthusiastic," "interesting," "humor," "students" and "passionate." When asked to talk about their favorite classes or professors, the overwhelming majority of students talked about specific professors by name and the qualities that made them stand out.

DISCUSSION

The present study explored the characteristics students look for in their professors and analyzed whether professors are aware of the characteristics students look for or have a different perception. Specifically, it was expected that students would rate and rank characteristics about professors themselves higher than characteristics about classes while professors would report believing that students would rate and rank class characteristics higher than professor characteristics. Overall, the study found that while students do prioritize professor characteristics over class characteristics, professors recognize this and reported believing that students would prioritize professor characteristics over class characteristics. Additionally, when it came to ranking the characteristics, the professors' top three characteristics matched the top the characteristics chosen by students, even though the top three characteristics for each were not in the same order. However, there were still a few characteristics that students ranked much higher than professors, like "a professor who has a positive attitude and a good sense of humor" and "a professor who is a good listener and values students' opinions."

An additional aspect of this study was to explore any differences that might exist between students in online classes versus face-to-face classes. Overall, there was no significant difference between students in online classes and students in face-to-face classes with regards to total ratings of characteristics or total rankings of characteristics. However, there was a significant difference between what professors believe students look for in online versus face-to-face classes. Specifically, professors believed students would rate professor characteristics as more important in online classes than in face-to-face classes. Professors believing that students want different things out of their online classes versus face-to-face

classes is likely the result of the large amounts of literature and research suggesting that online classes are much harder for students to complete successfully than face-to-face classes and that online classes require a different teaching approach from the professor (Tanyel & Griffin, 2014). A ten-year study comparing student outcomes in online versus face-to-face classes found that 30% of online students failed or withdrew from their class compared to 18% of the face-to-face students (Tanyel & Griffin, 2014). Especially now, with online learning on the rise, there are articles and reports in every corner of the internet making recommendations for how to be a better online teacher. One article stated that the strategies for improving online teaching include receiving and responding to student feedback, making connections with students and developing relationships, and communicating clearly to students (Terada, 2020), and the results of the present study do indicate that online students want these characteristics in their professors.

One possible explanation for seeing no significant difference between online and face-to-face students is that the characteristics that research shows students want in their online professors are the same characteristics students want in their face-to-face professors. Therefore, professors are attempting to change their methods of teaching along with the change in the format of delivery, but students want the same characteristics from their professors in online classes as they do in face-to-face classes. Another possible explanation for these results showing no significant difference between online and face-to-face students is that the wording of the online measures was kept as similar to that of the face-to-face measures as possible to ensure that online participants would have the same study experience as face-to-face participants. However, the wording might have also caused online students to imagine the characteristics being mentioned in general terms or even in terms of a face-to-

face class instead of an online class, even though they chose to participate in the study as an online student.

The next question in this study was to examine whether professors read/listen to the feedback they receive from students and, if they do, whether they believe the feedback. Overall, the three questions about professors believing student feedback and using it, both positive and negative feedback, to improve their teaching were the questions that received the lowest mean self-reported ratings from professors. However, even being the lowest means reported, all three means remained above the midpoint of 4. It was expected that professors would report believing positive feedback and ignoring negative feedback, but the results instead showed no statistically significant difference between the two. This shows that professors report utilizing all feedback, both positive and negative, equally in terms of improving their teaching methods. These results are corroborated by similar results received by researchers who looked specifically at the opinions higher education faculty have on course and teacher evaluations, which showed that professors viewed feedback from their students more positively than was expected from the initial literature review (Schmelkin, et al., 1997).

An additional goal of this study was to reveal if the characteristics that students mention about their favorite professors and classes are the same characteristics included in the ICCS-FTF, ICCS-O, ICCR-FTF and ICCR-O. Out of the top seven characteristics specifically mentioned by students, four of the characteristics (“approachable,” “enthusiastic,” “humor” and “interesting”) were also specifically mentioned in the ICCS-FTF, ICCS-O, ICCR-FTF and ICCR-O, three of which were the same characteristics that students ended up ranking as priorities number one (Professor who is personable and

approachable), three (Professor who is *enthusiastic* about teaching and the subject) and four (Professor who has a positive attitude and a good sense of *humor*).

The final aspect of this study was to explore the idea about where great teachers come from and what the data from this study suggest in terms of whether great teachers are born or made. The characteristics that were used in the measures of this study were separated into two categories, professor characteristics and class characteristics. Beyond these two categories, the characteristics included qualities that one can be naturally gifted with, such as personability, and qualities that are traditionally learned over time, such as communication skills. However, most of the characteristics mentioned qualities that could be naturally gifted or learned over time, such as a sense of humor, enthusiasm about a subject, a positive attitude and listening skills. The highest ranked characteristics by students included qualities from each of these categories. Personality, a naturally gifted quality, was ranked as the number one priority for students. Then ranked as the number two priority for students was communication skills, a quality that is traditionally learned over time. The remaining characteristics all included qualities that can be both naturally gifted and learned and improved over time. This discussion of nature versus nurture is where developmental psychology plays a role, where qualities that are inborn, like personality, combine with qualities that are learned, like communication skills, to create an individual that is uniquely capable of being an exceptional teacher. Overall, the conclusion that can be made from the data collected is that the most exceptional teachers, the teachers that students look for and choose above others, are the ones that are both naturally gifted with qualities that make them personable and approachable to students and have the experience and determination required to obtain the skills and improve the qualities that are learned over time.

Limitations and Conclusion

One of the limitations to this study is that all the data was self-reported. While this is exactly what was needed for examining the priorities of students, additional research would be required to validate the self-reported data collected from professors regarding their own opinions and usage of student feedback. Now that these results have corroborated that professors do have a good idea of about what students are looking for, a possible future direction for this study might be to examine the specific information that IDEA surveys from students provide to professors and investigate ways in which students could provide professors with more informed and detailed feedback that allows professors to see the specific characteristics and aspects of their teaching that students benefit from and enjoy.

Another limitation is the demographic data collected from professors. Professors were not asked questions about their title or position, therefore there is a lack of data to compare tenured professors to lecturers and adjunct professors. This created a sample that may not be completely representative of the professor population at Angelo State University. Additionally, due to the differences in characteristic sums and characteristic ranks between professors with different levels of teaching experience and the tendency for professors to have higher titles and positions with more experience, there could be some significant differences seen between tenured professors and lecturers or adjunct professors. A possible future direction of this study would be to replicate the study for professors and specify between tenured professors versus lecturers and adjunct professors. The data from this replication could then be analyzed to examine the difference between these different types of professors, if any.

Another possible future direction for this study is to address the lack of a significant difference between online and face-to-face students by replicating the study in a way that specifically analyzes the difference between the two perspectives. One possible way of doing this would be to reword the characteristics in the online measures, the ICCS-O and the ICCR-O, to include the word "online" or include phrases related specifically to online classes. This specification might allow students to imagine the characteristics in an online format instead of as a general idea, which then might create a significant difference between the characteristic sums and rankings of online students versus face-to-face students.

Overall, this study has the potential to inform professors about the areas in which their beliefs do not line up with what students have reported prioritizing in their professors. There are also several possible implications on the pedagogy and scholarship of teaching. Specifically, these findings regarding the lack of a difference between what students want in their professor in an online class versus a face-to-face class could alter the online pedagogy by allowing professors to focus more on connecting with students and building relationships the same way they would in a face-to-face class instead of focusing on what they previously believed they should be doing differently in an online class. Additionally, the results of this study have provided specific data and specific characteristics from students about the qualities they are looking for in their professors, some of which professors ranked much lower than students. This could further inform professors of the priority student place on certain characteristics and which characteristics are most important, which professors could then adopt into their own pedagogy.

REFERENCES

Arnon, S., & Reichel, N. (2007). Who is the ideal teacher? Am I? Similarity and difference in perception of students of education regarding the qualities of a good teacher and of their own qualities as teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 13(5),* 441-464.

Benton, S. L., & Li, D. (2015). *Validity and Reliability of IDEA Teaching Essentials.* Manhattan, KS: The IDEA Center.

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016). *Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness.* Berlin, Germany: ScienceOpen.

Bustamante, J. (2020, April 12). *Online Education Statistics*. Retrieved from EducationData.org: https://educationdata.org/online-education-statistics

Chakraborty, M., & Nafukho, F. M. (2014). Strengthening student engagement: what do students want in online courses? *European Journal of Training and Development, 38(9),* 782-802.

Curtis, D. A., & Moore, K. (2018). The first day of class: Starting with an activity or syllabus? *North American Journal of Psychology, 20(3),* 653-670.

Duff, S. M. (2017). *A comparative look at student and faculty perceptions of professors at a state college.* Boca Raton, FL: Florida Atlantic University.

Glazier, R., & Harris, H. S. (2020). Common Traits of the Best Online and Face-to-face Classes: Evidence from Student Surveys. APSA Preprints. http://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2020-n8fwf This content is a preprint and has not been peer-reviewed.

Guelfi, B. F., Tumelero, R. C., Antonelli, R. A., & Voese, S. B. (2018). To the teacher with love: the good teacher from the perspective of Generation Y accounting students. *Revista de Educação e Pesquisa Em Contabilidade, 12(1)*, 43-62.

Kirby, L. A., Busler, J. N., Keeley, J. W., & Buskist, W. (2018). A brief history of the Teacher Behavior Checklist. *Teaching and Learning*, 21-29.

Klafke, R., De Oliveira, M. C., & Ferreira, J. M. (2020). The good professor: A comparison between public and private universities. *Journal of Education, 200(1)*, 62-70.

Lederman, D. (2018, November 7). *Online Education Ascends*. Retrieved from Inside Higher Ed: https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2018/11/07/new-data-online-enrollments-grow-and-share-overall-enrollment

Malikow, M. (2006). Are teachers born or mad? The necessity of teacher training programs. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal, 16(3)*, 1-3.

Mandernach, B. J. (2019). Three ways to improve student engagement in the online classroom. *Online Classroom*, 1-2.

Moore, K., Curtis, D. A., Rives, M., Wood, J., & Good, C. M. (2018, April). Comparison of an online teaching demonstration and syllabus review in an online course. Poster presented at the 14th Annual Southwest Teachers of Psychology Conference, Houston, TX

Office of Accountability. (2020, Fall). *Faculty Assessment/IDEA.* Retrieved April 07, 2021, from https://www.angelo.edu/administrative-support/accountability/faculty_assessmentidea.php

Orlando, M. (2013, JAnuary 14). *Nine Characteristics of a Great Teacher.* Retrieved from Faculty Focus: https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/philosophy-of-teaching/nine-characteristics-of-a-great-teacher/

Plavšić, M., & Diković, M. (2016). Do teachers, students and parents agree about the top five good teacher's characteristics? *Education Provision to Every One: Comparing Perspectives from Around the World, 14(1),* 120-126.

Ross, S. (2015). Are influential teachers born or can they be taught? *Medical Education, 49(11),* 1058-1060.

Schmelkin, L. P., Spencer, K. J., & Gellman, E. S. (1997). Faculty Perspectives on Course and Teacher Evaluations. *Research in Higher Education, 38,* 575-592.

Scott, C., & Dinham, S. (2008). Born not made: the nativist myth and teachers' thinking. *Teacher Development, 12(2),* 115-124.

Seif, E., Kallick, B., & Costa, A. (2011). *Effective teachers are made, not born: habits of mind make the difference.* Retrieved from http://www.era3learning.org/resources/effective_tchrs_are_made.pdf

Singh, S., Pai, D. R., Sinha, N. K., Kaur, A., Soe, H. K., & Barua, A. (2013). Qualities of an effective teacher: what do medical teachers think? *BMC Medical Education, 13(128),* 1-7.

Smith, T., Maiden, E., & Abinader, M. (2019). Using students' perceptions of online teaching and learning to inform faculty development. *International Journal on E-Learning, 18(3),* 301-330.

Tanyel, F., & Griffin, J. (2014). A ten-year comparison of outcomes and persistence rates in online versus face-to-face courses. *B> quest, 1,* 22.

Terada, Y. (2020, September 4). *5 Research-Backed Tips to Improve Your Online Teaching Presence*. Retrieved from Edutopia.org: https://www.edutopia.org/article/5-research-backed-tips-improve-your-online-teaching-presence

Vasey, C., & Carroll, L. (2016). *How do We Evaluate Teaching?* Retrieved from American Association of University Professors: https://www.aaup.org/article/how-do-we-evaluate-teaching#.WrFBzOgbNPY%0A

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Student Demographic Questionnaire

Age: _____

Sex: ___Male ___Female ___Intersex ___Prefer not to answer

Gender: ___Woman ____Man ____Transgender ___Prefer not to answer

Race/Ethnicity:

____ 1) African American/Black

____ 2) Caucasian/European American

____ 3) Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander

____ 4) Native American/Alaskan Native

____ 5) Hispanic/Latina/Latino

____ 6) Biracial

____ 7) Multi racial

____ 8) Other: _____

Classification:

____ 1) Freshman

____ 2) Sophomore

____ 3) Junior

____ 4) Senior

____ 5) Graduate

Major/Department:

Undergraduate

____ 1) Accounting, Economics, and Finance

____ 2) Aerospace Studies/ROTC

____ 3) Agriculture

____ 4) Biology

____ 5) Chemistry and Biochemistry

____ 6) Communication and Mass Media

____ 7) Computer Science

____ 8) Engineering

____ 9) English and Modern Languages

____ 10) Health Science Professions

____ 11) History

____ 12) Kinesiology

____ 13) Management and Marketing

____ 14) Mathematics

____ 15) Nursing

____ 16) Physics and Geosciences

____ 17) Political Science and Philosophy

____ 18) Psychology and Sociology

____ 19) Security Studies and Criminal Justice

____ 20) Social Work

____ 21) Teacher Education

____ 22) Visual and Performing Arts

____ 23) Other Undergraduate: _____

____ 24) None

Graduate

____ 1) Accountancy, Professional

____ 2) Agriculture

____ 3) Animal Science

____ 4) Biology

____ 5) Biology, Science Education

____ 6) Business Administration

____ 7) Business Administration with Specialization in Healthcare Administration

____ 8) Coaching, Sport, Recreation, and Fitness Administration

____ 9) Communication

____ 10) Criminal Justice

____ 11) Curriculum and Instruction – Advanced Instructor

____ 12) Curriculum and Instruction – Professional Education

____ 13) Curriculum and Instruction – Teacher Studies

____ 14) Educational Administration

____ 15) Educational Leadership

____ 16) English

____ 17) Family Nurse Practitioner

____ 18) Global Security Studies

____ 19) Guidance and Counseling

____ 20) Homeland Security

____ 21) Intelligence and Analysis

____ 22) Nursing – Nurse Educator

____ 23) Physical Therapy

____ 24) Professional School Counseling

____ 25) Psychology – Applied

____ 26) Psychology – Counseling

____ 27) Psychology – Experimental

____ 28) Psychology – Industrial/Organizational

____ 29) Social Work

____ 30) Student Development and Leadership in Higher Education

____ 31) Other Graduate: _____

____ 32) None

Appendix B

Professor Demographic Questionnaire

Age: _____

Sex: ___Male ___Female ___Intersex ___Prefer not to answer

Gender: ___Woman ____Man ____Transgender ___Prefer not to answer

Race/Ethnicity:

____ 1) African American/Black

____ 2) Caucasian/European American

____ 3) Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander

____ 4) Native American/Alaskan Native

____ 5) Hispanic/Latina/Latino

____ 6) Biracial

____ 7) Multi racial

____ 8) Other: _____

Department:

Undergraduate

____ 1) Accounting, Economics, and Finance

____ 2) Aerospace Studies/ROTC

____ 3) Agriculture

____ 4) Biology

____ 5) Chemistry and Biochemistry

____ 6) Communication and Mass Media

____ 7) Computer Science

____ 8) Engineering

____ 9) English and Modern Languages

____ 10) Health Science Professions

____ 11) History

____ 12) Kinesiology

____ 13) Management and Marketing

____ 14) Mathematics

____ 15) Nursing

____ 16) Physics and Geosciences

____ 17) Political Science and Philosophy

____ 18) Psychology and Sociology

____ 19) Security Studies and Criminal Justice

____ 20) Social Work

____ 21) Teacher Education

____ 22) Visual and Performing Arts

____ 23) Other Undergraduate: _____

____ 24) None

Graduate

____ 1) Accountancy, Professional

____ 2) Agriculture

____ 3) Animal Science

____ 4) Biology

____ 5) Biology, Science Education

____ 6) Business Administration

____ 7) Business Administration with Specialization in Healthcare Administration

____ 8) Coaching, Sport, Recreation, and Fitness Administration

____ 9) Communication

____ 10) Criminal Justice

____ 11) Curriculum and Instruction – Advanced Instructor

____ 12) Curriculum and Instruction – Professional Education

____ 13) Curriculum and Instruction – Teacher Studies

____ 14) Educational Administration

____ 15) Educational Leadership

____ 16) English

____ 17) Family Nurse Practitioner

____ 18) Global Security Studies

____ 19) Guidance and Counseling

____ 20) Homeland Security

____ 21) Intelligence and Analysis

____ 22) Nursing – Nurse Educator

____ 23) Physical Therapy

____ 24) Professional School Counseling

____ 25) Psychology – Applied

____ 26) Psychology – Counseling

____ 27) Psychology – Experimental

____ 28) Psychology – Industrial/Organizational

____ 29) Social Work

____ 30) Student Development and Leadership in Higher Education

____ 31) Other Graduate: _____

____ 32) None

Subjects Taught: _____

Education Level:

____ 1) Associate Degree

____ 2) Bachelor's Degree

____ 2) Master's Degree

____ 3) Doctorate Degree

Years of Teaching Experience:

____ 1) <1

____ 2) 1-2

____ 3) 3-5

____ 4) 6-10

____ 5) 11-15

____ 6) 16-20

____ 7) 21+

Appendix C

Please rate the importance of each of the following characteristics:

Professor who is personable and approachable

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

How many class materials you will be required to purchase

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is an effective communicator

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Whether or not exams are open textbook/open note

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Class with a detailed syllabus and schedule that is followed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is enthusiastic about teaching and the subject

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Amount and type of homework and exams

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who has a positive attitude and a good sense of humor

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Whether attendance is required and/or if reasonable absences are allowed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who provides constructive and helpful feedback

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Fair and reasonable grading

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is a good listener and values students' opinions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who has realistic expectations of students

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

How much writing is required for exams and homework

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Clear course rules and classroom order

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is respectful of your time and manages class time wisely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who listens to student feedback and continually strives to improve their teaching

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Interesting and/or relevant course content

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Appendix D

Please rate the importance of each of the following characteristics:

Professor who is personable and approachable

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

How many class materials you will be required to purchase

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is an effective communicator

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Whether or not exams are open textbook/open note

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Class with a detailed syllabus and schedule that is followed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is enthusiastic about teaching and the subject

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Amount and type of homework and exams

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who has a positive attitude and a good sense of humor

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Whether attendance is required and/or if reasonable absences are allowed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who provides constructive and helpful feedback

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Fair and reasonable grading

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is a good listener and values students' opinions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who has realistic expectations of students

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

How much writing is required for exams and homework

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Classroom technology that is easy to use and understand

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who is reliably available and responsive via email

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Professor who listens to student feedback and continually strives to improve their teaching

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Interesting and/or relevant course content

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Important Extremely Important

Appendix E

Please rank the following characteristics from **most important** to **least important** by assigning *one* number (1-18) to each characteristic:

_____ Professor who is personable and approachable

_____ How many class materials you will be required to purchase

_____ Professor who is an effective communicator

_____ Whether or not exams are open textbook/open note

_____ Class with a detailed syllabus and schedule that is followed

_____ Professor who is enthusiastic about teaching and the subject

_____ Amount and type of homework and exams

_____ Professor who has a positive attitude and a good sense of humor

_____ Whether attendance is required and/or if reasonable absences are allowed

_____ Professor who provides constructive and helpful feedback

_____ Fair and reasonable grading

_____ Professor who is a good listener and values students' opinions

_____ Professor who has realistic expectations of students

_____ How much writing is required for exams and homework

_____ Clear course rules and classroom order

_____ Professor who is respectful of your time and manages class time wisely

_____ Professor who listens to student feedback and constantly strives to improve their teaching

_____ Interesting and/or relevant course content

Appendix F

Please rank the following characteristics from **most important** to **least important** by assigning *one* number (1-18) to each characteristic:

_____ Professor who is personable and approachable

_____ How many class materials you will be required to purchase

_____ Professor who is an effective communicator

_____ Whether or not exams are open textbook/open note

_____ Class with a detailed syllabus and schedule that is followed

_____ Professor who is enthusiastic about teaching and the subject

_____ Amount and type of homework and exams

_____ Professor who has a positive attitude and a good sense of humor

_____ Whether attendance is required and/or if reasonable absences are allowed

_____ Professor who provides constructive and helpful feedback

_____ Fair and reasonable grading

_____ Professor who is a good listener and values students' opinions

_____ Professor who has realistic expectations of students

_____ How much writing is required for exams and homework

_____ Classroom technology that is easy to use and understand

_____ Professor who is reliably available and responsive via email

_____ Professor who listens to student feedback and constantly strives to improve their teaching

_____ Interesting and/or relevant course content

Appendix G

Overall, do you decide which classes to register for based on the class itself or the professor teaching the class?

Class Professor

Appendix H

Below you will be asked seven questions about your personal opinions and use of student feedback when it comes to your teaching.

How often do you read IDEA evaluations or other student feedback about your teaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Never Always

How often do you listen to word-of-mouth student feedback about your teaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Never Always

How often do you believe the student feedback that you hear/read?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Never Always

How often do you use positive qualitative student feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Never Always

How often do you use negative qualitative student feedback you receive to improve your teaching methods?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Never Always

How valuable do consider student feedback to be?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Never Always

Appendix I

Now, think back on your favorite class and/or professor. What made that class or professor stand out? Please provide as many specific characteristics as you would like about your favorite class and/or professor:

Appendix J

IRB Approval Letter

ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Graduate Studies

Institutional Review Board

1/10/2021

Dr. Drew Curtis
Dept. of Psychology & Sociology
Angelo State University
San Angelo, TX 76909

Dear Drew:

The project that you submitted to the IRB for your student, Ms. Jaimee Hall, titled *"The Qualities College Students Want in Their Professors Versus Professors' Perceptions*" was reviewed and approved by Angelo State University's Institutional Review Board for the Protectionof Human Research Subjects in accordance with federal regulations 45 CFR 46.

This protocol has been approved effective January 10, 2021. If the study will continue past next year, please submit a notification of continuation at that time. Please note that any revisions to these approved materials must be approved by the IRB prior to initiation. All unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others, and any unexpected adverse events must be reported promptly to this office.

The approval number for your protocol is #CUR-011021. Please include this number in the subject line of in all future communications with the IRB regarding the protocol.

Sincerely,

Teresa (Tay) Hack

Digitally signed by Teresa (Tay) Hack
Date: 2021.01.10 09:32:58 -06'00

Teresa (Tay) Hack, Ph.D.
Chair of the Institutional Review Board

Dr. Teresa Hack, IRB Chair | ASU Station #11025 | San Angelo, Texas 76909
Phone: (325) 486-6121 | Fax: (325) 942-2194
Member, Texas Tech University System | Equal Opportunity Employer

BIOGRAPHY

Jaimee Hall is a graduate student in the Applied Psychology Program. She received her Bachelor of Science in Psychology in 2019 from Angelo State University. She will graduate with a Master of Science in Applied Psychology May 2021, where she will also be receiving her Teaching of Psychology Certification. Jaimee was also chosen as the 2020-2021 Applied Psychology Program's Graduate Student of the Year.